



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,389	01/27/2001	Jheroen P. Dorenbosch	PF01998NA	6849

20280 7590 07/21/2004

MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
ROOM AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HANH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/771,389

Applicant(s)

DORENBOSCH, JHEROEN P.

Examiner

Hanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Application filed on 1/27/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: On line 10, is “the identifier” referred to “the new Lan identifier” and “the previously stored identifier” referred to “the previously stored Lan identifier”? Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2 and 10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The limitation of sending step and transmitting step in claims 2 and 10 does not further limit the subject matter of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dowling et al.** (US Pat. No. 6574239 B1) in view of **Swildens et al.** (US Pat. No. 6,754,706 B1).

In claims 1, 2, 9 and 10, **Dowling et al.** discloses a remote unit 100 such as a lab top computer (col.5, lines 40-50) establishing a low connection setup time with a server via Internet (see col.4, line 5-10 & col.6, lines lines 35-40). In Fig.1, the remote unit comprises a CPU 105 (

Art Unit: 2662

a processor), memory 115 (a memory); and a communication module 125 comprising communication interface 210 (communication interface, see Fig.2) coupled to the CPU 105. See col.6, lines 10-40. A program module 120 is a software module (a program) executed from memory 115. In Fig.2, col.12, lines 40-60 & col.9, lines 60-65 & col.15, lines 1-10 the remote unit maintains in its memory 115 a table comprising communication sessions (a list of devices) to virtual server 215 (maintaining in a memory of portable subscriber unit a list of device). The remote establishes sessions (establishing new connection) via the virtual server 215. When the remote unit disconnects from connection 207, the virtual session is maintained within table 225 of virtual server 215. When the remote unit later wishes to reestablish session, the virtual server 215 is operative to keep the virtual session active and to allow the user rapid and nearly transparent access to application program 220 (performing, in response to establishing new connection, minimum connection setup time for subsequent connections). **Dowling et al.** does not disclose sending names of devices to domain name server of communication network to obtain IP address corresponding to the names; and transmitting a dummy IP packet to devices. **Swildens et al.** discloses, in Fig.2, user 201 asks a local client DNS server 203 what the ip address for url address 202 is (sendingnames of device to a domain name server to obtain ip address corresponding to the names). See col.4, lines 40-45. User 201 transmitting ping packet (dummy packet) to client domain name server 203 (transmitting a dummy IP packet to device). See col.6, lines 30-35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the Dowling et al. by sending name of remote unit to DNS to obtain Ip address as suggested by the teaching **Swildens et al.**. The motivation is to reduce setup connection time.

In claims 3, 4, 5, 11, 12 and 13, **Dowling et al.** does not disclose subscriber units has not communicated for a predetermined length of time; has recently communicated; and has most frequently communicated over a predetermined time period. Since the specification discloses in page 5 that the length of time communicated is a time stamp, therefore; **Swildens et al.** discloses, a time stamp in remote unit 's table. See col.6, lines 1-5. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use the time stamp in the Dowling et al. to determine how long or how often the subscriber communicate.

In claims 6 and 14, Dowling et al. discloses, in Fig.2, a communication interface 210 coupled to the remote unit 100. The communication interface 210 maintains connection between the remote unit and Internet or PSTN . (See col.11, lines 25-40)

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Further, since claims 7 and 15 are objected because of informalities, the objected limitations are required to be amended for clarification.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In claims 7 and 15, the prior art fails to disclose comparing an identifier of the new LAN with a previously stored identifier of a most recently connected old LAN, and wherein prior to the performing step, the sending and transmitting steps are not necessary when the new LAN identifier is equal to the previously stored LAN identifier.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dailey (US Pat. No. 6,564,049 B1) discloses Method and Systems for Providing Group Calls with Reduced Setup Times.

Kohler (US Pat. No. 5,887,264) discloses Telecommunication Process and Device Suitable for Carrying Out the Process.

Valentine et al. (US Pat. No. 6,363,253 B1) discloses System and Method for Flash Call Based Cellular Network.

Smolik (US Pat. No. 6,119,005) discloses System for Automated Determination of Handoff Neighbor List for Cellular Communication Systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 703 306-5445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8AM to 4:30PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on 703 305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2662

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Nguyen

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hanh Nguyen', written over the printed name.

July 13, 2004